
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH

JAMES SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID ANGERHOFER et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION &
ORDER TO CURE DEFICIENT
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Case No. 2:20-CV-14-DAK

District Judge Dale A. Kimball

In this *pro se* prisoner civil-rights action, *see* 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2021),¹ having screened Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, (ECF No. 22), under its statutory review function,² the Court orders Plaintiff to file a third amended complaint to cure deficiencies before further pursuing claims.

¹The federal statute creating a "civil action for deprivation of rights" reads, in pertinent part:

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory . . . , subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.

42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2021).

²The screening statute reads:

(a) Screening.—The court shall review . . . a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

(b) Grounds for dismissal.—On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—

(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or

(2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C.S. § 1915A (2021).

COMPLAINT'S DEFICIENCIES

Complaint:

- (a) appears to inappropriately allege civil-rights violations on respondeat-superior theory--i.e., supervisor liability (e.g., Wardens Devon Blood and Shane Nelson).
- (b) does not attempt names or detailed description of John Doe defendants.
- (c) does not adequately state claim of inadequate medical treatment. (See below.)
- (d) needs clarification regarding unnecessary-rigor cause of action under Utah Constitution. (See below.)
- (e) does not affirmatively link all constitutional violations to named defendants. (See below.)
- (f) alleges "random and unauthorized deprivation of property under color of state law," without considering that such a claim "does not give rise to a § 1983 claim if there is an adequate state post-deprivation remedy." *See Frazier v Flores*, No. 13-1535, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 12936, at *4 (10th Cir. July 9, 2014) (unpublished) (citing *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984)).
- (g) possibly asserts claims past statute of limitations for civil-rights case. (See below.)
- (h) inappropriately names state contract attorney as defendant. (See below.)
- (i) has claims apparently regarding confinement; however, complaint apparently not drafted with contract attorneys' help.

GUIDANCE FOR PLAINTIFF

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a complaint to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction . . . ; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought." Rule 8's requirements mean to guarantee "that defendants enjoy fair notice of what the claims against them are and the grounds upon which they rest." *TV Commc'ns Network, Inc. v ESPN, Inc.*, 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991).

Pro se litigants are not excused from meeting these minimal pleading demands. "This is so because a pro se plaintiff requires no special legal training to recount the facts surrounding his alleged injury, and he must provide such facts if the court is to determine whether he makes out a claim on which relief can be granted." *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). Moreover, it is improper for the Court "to assume the role of advocate for a pro se litigant." *Id.* Thus, the Court cannot "supply additional facts, [or] construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded." *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989).

Plaintiff should consider these general points before filing an amended complaint:

(i) The revised complaint must stand entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of the original complaint. *See Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supersedes original). The amended complaint may also not be added to after it is filed without moving for amendment.³

(ii) The complaint must clearly state what each defendant--typically, a named government employee--did to violate Plaintiff's civil rights. *See Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (stating personal participation of each named defendant is essential allegation in civil-rights action). "To state a claim, a complaint must 'make clear exactly

³ The rule on amending a pleading reads:

(a) Amendments Before Trial.

(1) Amending as a Matter of Course. A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within:

(A) 21 days after serving it, or

(B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.

(2) Other Amendments. In all other cases, a party may amend its pleadings only with the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15.

who is alleged to have done *what* to *whom*." *Stone v. Albert*, 338 F. App'x 757, 759 (10th Cir. 2009) (unpublished) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)). Plaintiff should also include, as much as possible, specific dates or at least estimates of when alleged constitutional violations occurred.

(iii) Each cause of action, together with the facts and citations that directly support it, should be stated separately. Plaintiff should be as brief as possible while still using enough words to fully explain the "who," "what," "where," "when," and "why" of each claim. *Robbins*, 519 F.3d at 1248 ("The [*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*] Court was particularly critical of complaints that 'mentioned no specific, time, place, or person involved in the alleged [claim].' [550 U.S. 544, 565] n.10 (2007). Given such a complaint, 'a defendant seeking to respond to plaintiff's conclusory allegations . . . would have little idea where to begin.' *Id.*").

(iv) Plaintiff may not name an individual as a defendant based solely on supervisory position. *See Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.2d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone does not support § 1983 liability).

(v) Grievance denial alone with no connection to "violation of constitutional rights alleged by plaintiff, does not establish personal participation under § 1983." *Gallagher v. Shelton*, 587 F.3d 1063, 1069 (10th Cir. 2009).

(vi) "No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under . . . Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." 42 U.S.C.S. § 1997e(a) (2021). However, Plaintiff need not include grievance details in his complaint. Exhaustion of administrative remedies is an affirmative defense that must be raised by Defendants. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 216 (2007).

• Inadequate Medical Treatment

The Eighth Amendment’s ban on cruel and unusual punishment requires prison officials to “provide humane conditions of confinement” including “adequate . . . medical care.” *Craig v. Eberly*, 164 F.3d 490, 495 (10th Cir. 1998)) (quoting *Barney v. Pulsipher*, 143 F.3d 1299, 1310 (10th Cir. 1998)). To state a cognizable claim under the Eighth Amendment for failure to provide proper medical care, “a prisoner must allege acts or omissions *sufficiently harmful* to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.” *Olson v. Stotts*, 9 F.3d 1475, 1477 (10th Cir. 1993) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

Any Eighth Amendment claim must be evaluated under objective and subjective prongs: (1) “Was the deprivation sufficiently serious?” And, if so, (2) “Did the officials act with a sufficiently culpable state of mind?” *Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294, 298 (1991).

Under the objective prong, a medical need is “sufficiently serious . . .if it is one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor’s attention.” *Sealock*, 218 F.3d at 1209 (citations & quotation marks omitted).

The subjective component requires the plaintiff to show that prison officials were consciously aware that the prisoner faced a substantial risk of harm and wantonly disregarded the risk “by failing to take reasonable measures to abate it.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 847 (1994). “[T]he ‘inadvertent failure to provide adequate medical care’ tantamount to negligence does not satisfy the deliberate indifference standard.” *Sparks v. Singh*, 690 F. App’x 598, 604 (10th Cir. 2017) (unpublished) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 105–06 (1976)). Furthermore, “a prisoner who merely disagrees with a diagnosis or a prescribed course of

treatment does not state a constitutional violation.” *Perkins v. Kan. Dep’t of Corrs.*, 165 F.3d

803, 811 10th Cir. 1999); *see also Gee v. Pacheco*, 627 F.3d 1178, 1192 (10th Cir. 2010)

(“Disagreement with a doctor’s particular method of treatment, without more, does not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation.”).

• Unnecessary Rigor

Article I, § 9 of the Utah Constitution states in part, “[p]ersons arrested or imprisoned shall not be treated with unnecessary rigor.” Although this clause “closely approximates the language of the Eighth Amendment,” it has no federal counterpart. *Dexter v. Bosko*, 2008 UT 29, 184 P.3d 592, 595. The Utah Supreme Court has had “few opportunities to interpret or apply the unnecessary rigor.” *Id.* Nonetheless, the Utah Supreme Court has held that the unnecessary rigor clause “protects [prisoners and arrestees] against unnecessary abuse . . . that is ‘needlessly harsh, degrading or dehumanizing.’” *Id.* at 595 (quoting *Bott v. Deland*, 922 P.2d 732, 737 (Utah 1996)). To state a claim for a violation of the unnecessary rigor clause, the violation “must arise from ‘treatment that is clearly excessive or deficient and unjustified, not merely the frustrations, inconveniences, and irritations that are common to prison life.’” *Id.* at 597 (quoting *Bott*, 922 P.2d at 741). When the claim of unnecessary rigor arises from an injury, a constitutional violation is made out only when the act complained of presented a substantial risk of serious injury for which there was no reasonable justification at the time. *Id.* (quoting *Bott*, 922 P.2d at 741). The conduct at issue, moreover, “must be more than negligent to be actionable.” *Id.*

In addition to these requirements, a plaintiff must also establish three elements to support an unnecessary rigor claim: (1) “A flagrant violation of his or her constitutional rights;” (2) “Existing remedies do not redress his or her injuries;” and, (3) “Equitable relief, such as an injunction, was and is wholly inadequate to protect the plaintiff’s rights or redress his or her injuries.” *Id.* at 597-98 (quoting *Spackman v. Bd. of Educ.*, 2000 UT 87, 16 P.3d 533, 538-39 (Utah 2000)).

. . . [However, Plaintiff’s] § 1983 claims likely serve as existing remedies that redress his injuries[, moot[ing] the need to also bring an unnecessary rigor claim].”

Asay v. Daggett County, No. 2:18-CV-422, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5794, at * (D. Utah Jan. 11, 2019).

• **Affirmative Link**

[A] plaintiff who brings a constitutional claim under § 1983 can't obtain relief without first satisfying the personal-participation requirement. That is, the plaintiff must demonstrate the defendant "personally participated in the alleged constitutional violation" at issue. *Vasquez v. Davis*, 882 F.3d 1270, 1275 (10th Cir. 2018). Indeed, because § 1983 is a "vehicle[] for imposing personal liability on government officials, we have stressed the need for careful attention to particulars, especially in lawsuits involving multiple defendants." *Pahls v. Thomas*, 718 F.3d 1210, 1225 (10th Cir. 2013); *see also Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008) (explaining that when plaintiff brings § 1983 claims against multiple defendants, "it is particularly important . . . that the complaint make clear exactly *who* is alleged to have done *what* to *whom*"); *Tonkovich v. Kan. Bd. of Regents*, 159 F.3d 504, 532-33 (10th Cir. 1998)) (holding that district court's analysis of plaintiff's § 1983 claims was "infirm" where district court "lump[ed]" together plaintiff's claims against multiple defendants--"despite the fact that each of the defendants had different powers and duties and took different actions with respect to [plaintiff]"--and "wholly failed to identify specific actions taken by particular defendants that could form the basis of [a constitutional] claim").

Estate of Roemer v. Johnson, 764 F. App'x 784, 790-91 (10th Cir. 2019).

"A plaintiff's failure to satisfy this requirement will trigger swift and certain dismissal." *Id.* at 790 n.5. Indeed, the Tenth Circuit has "gone so far as to suggest that failure to satisfy the personal-participation requirement will not only justify dismissal for failure to state a claim; it will render the plaintiff's claim frivolous." *Id.*

• **Statute of Limitations**

"Utah's four-year residual statute of limitations . . . governs suits brought under section 1983." *Fratus v. DeLand*, 49 F.3d 673, 675 (10th Cir. 1995). Plaintiff's claims accrued when

"facts that would support a cause of action are or should be apparent." *Id.* at 675 (citation omitted. From the Complaint's face, some circumstances possibly occurred more than four years before this case was filed.

• **Contract-Attorney Liability**

As private attorneys contracted by the Utah Department of Corrections to provide initial legal services for state prisoners, contract attorneys, such as Defendant David Angerhofer, are not "state actors." First, though lawyers are generally licensed by states, "they are not officials of government by virtue of being lawyers." *In re Griffiths*, 413 U.S. 717, 729 (1973). Further, precedent holds that private contractors' acts do not become governmental acts under § 1983 by reason of their significant or even total involvement in executing the terms of public contracts. *Rendell-Baker v. Kohn*, 457 U.S. 830, 841 (1982). "[The Fourteenth] Amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful." *Shelly v. Kramer*, 334 U.S. 1, 14 (1948).

An earlier case decided in this Court is persuasive: *Smith v. Freestone*, Case No. 2:97-CV-944. A Report and Recommendation adopted in a dismissal order by the district-court judge, states, "Prison contract attorneys do not work under color of state law for purposes of § 1983." *See id.*, slip op. at 3 (D. Utah Aug. 20, 1998). The dismissal was affirmed by the Tenth Circuit, ruling that attorneys contracting with the state to provide legal help to inmates were not acting under "color of state law" in performing those duties. *Smith v. Freestone*, No. 99-4005, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 16766, at *2 (10th Cir. July 20, 1999); *cf. Polk County v Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 321 (1981) ("[A] public defender is not amenable to administrative direction in the same sense as other employees of the State.").

A good final point: Like public defenders, contract attorneys work under canons of professional responsibility that govern their exercise of independent judgment on behalf of clients. “[T]he canons of professional ethics impose limits on permissible advocacy.” *Dodson*, 454 U.S. at 323. In other words, every lawyer, whether privately retained or publicly appointed, is charged to avoid clogging the courts with frivolous claims. *See id.*

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

(1) Plaintiff must within thirty days cure the complaint’s deficiencies noted above by filing a document entitled, “Third Amended Complaint,” that does not refer to or include any other document.

(2) The Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff the Pro Se Litigant Guide with a blank-form civil-rights complaint which Plaintiff must use if he wishes to pursue his potential claims further.

(3) If Plaintiff fails to timely cure the above deficiencies according to this Order's instructions, this action will be dismissed without further notice.

(4) Plaintiff shall not try to serve the amended complaint on Defendants; instead, the Court will perform its screening function and determine itself whether the amended complaint warrants service. No motion for service of process is needed. *See* 28 U.S.C.S. § 1915(d) (2021) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [*in forma pauperis*] cases.”). All defendants and claims should be included in a third amended complaint, if filed, and will not be treated further by the Court unless properly included. This is the **FINAL** order allowing Plaintiff to cure deficiencies. If a third amended complaint is filed, the Court will screen it for dismissal or service of process.

(5) Plaintiff must tell the Court of any address change and timely comply with Court orders. *See* D. Utah Civ. R. 83-1.3(e) ("In all cases, counsel and parties appearing *pro se* must notify the clerk's office immediately of any change in address, email address, or telephone number."). Failure to do so may result in this action's dismissal for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) ("If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it. Unless the dismissal order states otherwise, a dismissal under this subdivision (b) and any dismissal not under this rule--except one for lack of jurisdiction, improper venue, or failure to join a party under Rule 19--operates as an adjudication on the merits.").

(6) Time extensions are disfavored, though reasonable extensions may be granted. Any motion for time extension must be filed no later than **fourteen days** before the deadline to be extended.

(7) No direct communication is to take place with any judge. All relevant information, letters, documents, and papers, labeled with case number, are to be directed to the Clerk of Court.

DATED this 27th day of December, 2021.

BY THE COURT:


JUDGE DALE A. KIMBALL
United States District Court